

5253

DECISION



Watherspoon P.L.#1
**THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548**

FILE: B-190159

DATE: February 1, 1978

MATTER OF: Southern Oregon Aggregate, Inc.

DIGEST:

Prior decision is affirmed upon reconsideration since it has not been shown that prior decision was based on errors of fact or law.

Southern Oregon Aggregate, Inc. (S.O.A), has requested reconsideration of our decision in Southern Oregon Aggregate, Inc., B-190159, December 16, 1977, 77-2 CPD 477, in which we denied its protest of the rejection of its bid as late.

S.O.A.'s bid was hand-delivered by a commercial delivery service to a building in the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Denver Service Center, Denver, Colorado, installation that was not the address specified in the IFB. After the bid was delivered to the "wrong" address, it was apparently lost by Government employees and not found until after bid opening. SOA argued that it was standard practice to deliver to the "wrong" address because delivery services often had difficulty making delivery at the correct address. S.O.A. contended that the common carrier was misled by the Government into misdelivering the package, and that other Government mishandling led to rejection of its bid.


We held that since the common carrier delivered the bid to the wrong address on its own initiative, any subsequent Government mishandling was not the "paramount reason" for the late receipt of the bid, and therefore the bid was properly rejected.

Section 20.9 of our Bid Protest Procedures, which provides for reconsideration of a decision, requires that requests for reconsideration "contain a detailed statement of the factual and legal grounds upon which

B-190159

reversal or modification is deemed warranted, specifying any errors of law made ***." 4 C.F.R. § 20.9(a) (1977). S.O.A.'s request for reconsideration merely reiterates the arguments made in its original protest, and disagrees with the equity of our decision. Since the protester has made no showing that our prior conclusion is erroneous, we see no reason to consider these arguments further.

Therefore, the prior decision is affirmed.


Deputy Comptroller General
of the United States